

SECRET

. . . . The 152nd meeting of the CIA RETIREMENT BOARD convened at
2:00 p.m. on Thursday, 18 February 1971, with the following present:

Mr. Harry B. Fisher, Chairman
[redacted] OP Member
[redacted] DI Member
[redacted] CT Member
[redacted] Member
[redacted], Legal Advisor
[redacted], Technical Advisor
[redacted], Executive Secretary
[redacted], Recording Secretary

25X1

25X1

Guests: [redacted]

MR. FISHER: I have a gentleman waiting outside and I'm told that he
is on a tight schedule up from [redacted]. It is on the [redacted] case --
number four. As you see he has listed a certain amount of time as a military
detailee, which obviously doesn't count, then he speaks of March 1961 through
1967 he was at [redacted] in [redacted] for CT, Staff Employees,
and Foreign Nationals, including the [redacted] Program, then he has a couple of
good years in Vietnam, but in paragraph three he speaks of the period - I'm sorry,
he again mentioned 1961 through 1967 and you drop to paragraph five and he says,
"The [redacted] Project and other [redacted] conducted at this instal-
lation during the period 1962 to 1965." I found myself a little confused as to
how much time he really put in on the [redacted] --

[redacted]: The Cuban Project.

MR. FISHER: Yes, the Cuban Project. Frankly, I wasn't aware they ran
in one team after another into [redacted]. I didn't know it was that intensive.

[redacted]: That's right.

MR. FISHER: That type of training looks good but I'm wondering how much
time he spent on it because he does need 31 and a half months. [redacted] is down at
[redacted] but this man, [redacted], was his supervisor during this period.

. . . . [redacted] then joined the meeting

MR. FISHER: [redacted] I guess it was ^{an opportunity} ~~an opportunity~~ that you happened to
be up here today and that [redacted] worked under you during this period at [redacted]

[redacted] Yes.

MR. FISHER: We are trying to zero in a little bit on the amount of
time he really spent, particularly in the [] training. He apparently was
at [] from 1961 through 1967.

[]: That's about right.

MR. FISHER: But I gather the [] Project was from 1962 to 1965.
During the period of time he was there can you identify what he was doing?

[]: It was difficult because Jim was one of the senior instructors -
we'd get a group of [] in and one of the senior instructors would be made
basically responsible and at the same time he had an area of responsibility. Jim
was primarily a [] senior instructor so that
he would alternate with several of the other senior instructors as chief of
the particular [] group and at the same time he would be [] instructor
and giving a great deal of time to them. He was also a senior instructor and
rotated through and made a senior referee on field activities -- that is, field
exercises -- at which he had overall complete responsibility for the health,
well being, safety and instruction of the students while they were there. This
included [] exercises. He had full responsibility for [] all
firing whether live or blank, and also of course for grading and instructing the
students at the same time.

MR. FISHER: And did this go on for the entire six-year period? He implied
it was conducted during the period 1962 through 1965 or at least it required a
maximum effort.

MR. FISHER: When did it phase out, approximately?

[]: Approximately 1965 or 1966.

MR. FISHER: And it was going on in 1962?

25X1

[]: Yes. Here again, I would say, yes or certainly very shortly thereafter.

25X1

25X1 MR. FISHER: And during that period there was almost constant training of [] groups at []

25X1

[]: Yes, we had a pretty wild time. This was in addition to our normal staff responsibility. 25X1

25X1

MR. FISHER: The []

[]: In actual fact, I hope.

25X1

MR. FISHER: Does anyone else have anything? (no response) Again, I have indicated [] techniques and so on.

25X1

[]: Yes.

25X1

MR. FISHER: In your opinion was it hazard duty?

[]: Oh, by your working through an interpreter of questionable knowledge and to a bunch of people you didn't know whether your instructions had gotten across until he tried it []

25X1

25X1

MR. FISHER: -- whether

25X1

25X1 []: You carried the [] and at sometime or other you

[]
It is very unpleasant work at times and at other times it is very rewarding.

25X1

[]: I take it during this period if there were any slack periods that he would have been engaged in teaching or working with trainees or some similar sort of thing.

25X1

[] Exactly.

[]: More or less constant service in the business of hand holding.

[] Definitely. I don't think during this period - everybody lost 50% of their annual leave and Jim lost most of his.

MR. FISHER: Thanks very much. Apparently there are no further questions.

25X1

. . . . [] then left the room

25X1

25X1

[]: I'd like to make a statement in support of his position.

25X1

In 1964 and '65 I worked for [] I was also [] Coordinator and we were fully staffed all the time and we didn't taper off till 1966. We had made plans to

taper off and then the big confrontation put us into the next phase but we were still training and that was our principle point even more than the [] area.

MR. FISHER: That's good if we can extend this to a six year period. It's a lot easier than a three year period. You are confirming '61 through '66?

[] Yes, I can speak up to when I left in 1965 when it was still running at a very high level.

MR. FISHER: Do I have a motion?

[]: I move we approve.

[]: Second.

. . . . This motion was then passed

[]: He is going to reach his cross-over point before he reaches age 60 so he is buying an option to retire any time.

MR. FISHER: He has not stated. This is not a retirement action.

I would like to take a minute to run through this - I think I mentioned last time there is a pattern here from the Director which I think you should be aware of. The message to me is when they get past 62 watch out. He intends to zero in. As I mentioned last time he reduced [] extension. We have [] where we recommended a one year extension. If you remember she was 62 in April 1971 and this requested an extension till '72 and it spoke about her unique ability to handle the funding of these [] operations and that she knew where all the bodies were buried. On this one Colonel White apparently spoke to [], and sent it back to him and now has a new recommendation which didn't even go through us saying, "Okay, I'll take six months," which the Director has signed off on, so he cut that back to six months.

[]: That six months being up to age 62?

MR. FISHER: It actually carries her a little past.

We requested a one year extension on [] She will be 62 years of age in March '71. The Historical Officer states she is doing a great job and DDP concurred. He cut that back to June of '71 instead of March '72 -- he cut that back nine months.

[] The part about CIARDS --

MR. FISHER: Well, I left it with [] to sort of chew on.

[]: She might be eligible?

SECRET

25X1

[]: She has 60 months, but after she turned 60.

25X1

[]: This was a little confusing. The funny thing is I do think this woman is getting to work past age 62 because she turned down CIARDS in her own mind. The fact is she never was officially asked if she wanted to get in CIARDS and that left us a little confused. Colonel White was itchy because he likes the idea nobody gets in past 60 but he left it that if we really think she has had a raw deal he would go along, bearing in mind had she been in initially she would have been out two years ago. I say that but I'm not even sure of that because she was overseas and it's possible DDP might have said to extend her for one year, even in CIARDS. You are left with an unknown. The worst thing is we never went through the motions. If she went to the IG and said she should be in CIARDS, we couldn't show anything where she was asked and she officially rejected CIARDS. I guess you haven't pursued this much further. (Addressing [])

[]: Actually it was a question of whether you wanted me to talk to her directly. I didn't know how she might react to the extension. I still feel that she really didn't have her opportunity in CIARDS. We are conjecturing what might have happened if it had been offered. The fact is it was never offered.

MR. FISHER: [], you would be interested. A letter was prepared from WH to go to her to tell her of her option to get into CIARDS and when it got to CSPA there was some technical error in this letter so they sent it back to have that rewritten and it went down the drain. It never went out to her. I can't prove this but in an FRQ she explained, "I want to work till '62 if I can." I'm satisfied that she knew what she was doing and preferred Civil Service because she could stay on longer but I still have to say she never said, "No, thank you." So it's a technicality. I don't know. I supposed you could talk to her and see how she feels about it. I hate to get away from this precedent. It might be a unique case.

[]: Yes.

MR. FISHER: Again the message on age 62 - I'm curious to see what he does with the Doctor from TSD.

25X1

[]: The other was [], where he cut back the six months.

[]: We recommended, no on that one.

MR. FISHER: He went along with the Board.

[]: What about the Doctor in TSD?

SECRET

SECRET

25X1

25X1

MR. FISHER: [REDACTED]. We pinned [REDACTED] down to say that this was the last one. I'm just curious to see whether he will approve it.

Has everybody had a chance to look at the Minutes? This is the January 7, Minutes. If there are no changes then let them stand and we move on to 2.A. That is the five year designations.

25X1

[REDACTED] I have one fellow here who wants to get in and retire within the next couple of months and I can just pass these out. If we can get an approval for him to come into the system. The E Career Service forgot to include him two years ago.

25X1

MR. FISHER: Does he have the necessary qualifying service?

25X1

[REDACTED]: He has more than that. We have verified 65 but he has 80.

25X1

MR. FISHER: [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] He was just here on TDY last week and he raised this and he signed an application while he was here last week.

25X1

[REDACTED] and he is going to retire the end of May.

[REDACTED]: But he is not in the system---

25X1

MR. FISHER: He obviously has the credit for it.

[REDACTED] -- so I added him on.

25X1

MR. FISHER: Are we to handle this as a request for retirement?

[REDACTED] I'd like to handle it as both -- participation and retirement.

25X1

He has already signed the voluntary retirement.

MR. FISHER: [REDACTED], age 59, 22 years service, 11 with the Agency and

65 months overseas.

25X1

25X1

[REDACTED] Is he in [REDACTED]?

[REDACTED]: He is coming back to retire in May.

MR. FISHER: I see no problem. He seems fully qualified in all respects.

May I have a motion?

25X1

[REDACTED] I so move.

[REDACTED] Second.

25X1

MR. FISHER: Okay, that is [REDACTED]

. . . . This motion was then passed

MR. FISHER: I am back to the eight five-year designees. All seem to meet the criteria.

25X1

[REDACTED] I move we approve.

[REDACTED] Second.

. . . . This motion was then passed

25X1

MR. FISHER: We have a voluntary retirement by [REDACTED]

SECRET

SECRET

25X1

[]: I move.
[]: Second.

25X1

. . . . This motion was then passed

25X1

25X1

[]: May I read off the pile of voluntaries? [],

[] --

25X1

MR. FISHER: Where are these people from?

25X1

[]

[]

MR. FISHER: May I have a motion on these?

25X1

[]: I so move.
[]: I second.

25X1

. . . . This motion was then passed

25X1

[]: I have one involuntary -- []. He is

COMMO.

25X1

[]: He is 48 years old and retires with 58 percent.

25X1

25X1

MR. FISHER: Okay, that takes care of 2.A. and B. Then we have []

[]: This is the first time we have had a Career Agent that wasn't
in CIARDS.

25X1

MR. FISHER: This one boils down to be a fairly clear-cut decision. I have
talked to [] on this and I have satisfied myself that they are in an operational
bind and they need this man for a year to do the job for which he is uniquely
qualified. As you see, [] said okay, but next year you are going to have a
replacement, so we are down to a decision as to the best way of accomplishing this
and there are two ways. We can defer his retirement, bearing in mind he is now 62
and a half years old, for one more year or it would be acceptable to the DDP to retire
him immediately and then reemploy him as an annuitant with a one year contract. We
don't have the computations here. He obviously has a pretty small annuity coming to
him because he didn't start with us until fairly late.

25X1

[]: Six years and two months.

MR. FISHER: I instinctively feel the man is bailing us out. It's almost
punative to tell him he has got to retire and we'll hire him on a contract and he
will only get 90% of what he would get if we extend him for a year.

25X1

[]: That contract wouldn't be in addition to his retirement?

MR. FISHER: No, unfortunately not. He'd get a supplemental annuity for
that one year.

*Yes if would
with 90%
rule*

SECRET

25X1

[]: Would he be eligible for Social Security?

MR. FISHER: No, not both. He'd be better off under Civil Service.

He might have enough Social Security to cover that. It kind of boils down to this: they are not coming out and saying he is doing us a favor but we need him and it's a question of do we make him work for 90% of what he would otherwise work for or would it be a little cleaner to allow him to add to his regular annuity?

25X1

[]: Then it goes to the Director and he won't approve it.

MR. FISHER: That's possible, although with this one the operational need might be a little clearer.

25X1

25X1

[] He has had 16 years with the airlines and two years with the Agency []

25X1

[]: So he has Social Security.

25X1

MR. FISHER: [], would you like to talk on this thing?

25X1

[]: After you called I checked into it and I think it would be better to continue him for the remaining six months in his Career employment.

25X1

MR. FISHER: It's a year.

[]: I don't see any sense in letting him retire and then reemploying him on contract.

25X1

[] I think we ought to recommend it. The Director might overrule us but --

25X1

MR. FISHER: If we recommend it we can put the word in we really need this man. He fills an operational requirement and he is going to [] for us. I don't know how much this puts him out. That's what I really don't have a feel for.

25X1

[]: They went looking for him. They had a turnover of managers there that were quite unsatisfactory.

25X1

MR. FISHER: The project is in [] where expenses are greater than they are here and we would be forcing him to work at a reduced salary. I'm willing to go with that and if he wants to reverse it he can.

25X1

[]: I think there is a question of Board function if we send this up for him to make a decision. It seems to me he has laid down the policy that's fairly clearly enunciated.

25X1

[] Has he laid it down or just acted on a couple of cases?
[] I think the age 60 policy is perfectly clear and anything beyond that is a step by step sort of extension and I don't think we are really doing much of a service to him if we simply buck it up and say this is over 62.

SECRET

MR. FISHER: I think you are overstating it. We can go the other way. If everyone was turned down, he wouldn't need us either. I think we are to bring our best judgement on what is equitable.

25X1

[]: I don't think we have made a case that it is an inequity to put this man on contract. We know nothing about him. This guy could be worth a million bucks and the money means nothing, so why should we worry about whether he is employed on a contract at 90% or not. We have nothing of that sort so what are we basing our decision on?

25X1

MR. FISHER: I happen to know a little more because they came down to talk to []. They said they were trying to figure out what was the best way of getting him because they need him. I give some credence to the fact that they really need this fellow and are not finding a job for a guy who is about to retire.

25X1

[]: Why wouldn't it work perfectly well by putting him on contract? Their requirements are equally well met, it seems to me, and we have upheld a principle in that at age 60, and in some cases 62, they retire. It seems to me that is the approach we ought to take.

25X1

[]: What basically is the difference whether he is a Career Agent or a Contract Employee? He is hired in both cases -- in one 10% more than the other. In neither case is he under staff ceiling. I'm not sure I --

25X1

[]: Both are contract.

MR. FISHER: It's a different type of contract. We have decided that Career Agents will be subject to the same retirement policy as anyone else, so I don't think we can brush that under the table. I agree in terms of not counting against the ceiling that that might be very meaningful to Colonel White.

25X1

25X1

[]: You have the other factor -- [] saying it is just for a year. There is no rule on Contract Employees.

25X1

[]: And that makes no real difference.

25X1

[] said only for one year.

[]: You know the history is if they don't do that in that year we are right back in business a year hence.

25X1

MR. FISHER: How do you feel, Bob?

[]: It may benefit the man if he went out as a reemployed annuitant. He may benefit more from a retirement.

25X1

[]: I think he already has his Social Security.

SECRET

SECRET

25X1

[] Sometimes you can benefit more by getting both.

MR. FISHER: One previous disadvantage has been eliminated by changing that retirement law. There was a time when a supplemental annuitant had no survivor benefits so if you earned another \$300.00 that was only good through the life of the man himself, so that would be another argument in favor of letting him extend. The new law says even a supplemental annuitant may have a survival benefit. I'd say it boils down pretty much there is no difference in the ultimate annuity of adding supplemental to basic rather than recalculating the whole thing. To me, if you were in a 10 or 11 year --

25X1

[] -- on the salary of that last year because in the calculations that could be one of the high three years. It seems to me Tom himself could initiate a conversion from Career Agent to Contract Employee status by virtue of this new policy yet to be published. He himself, as the Deputy Director of Plans, could extend this as a Contract Employee for a year.

MR. FISHER: If you really agree to go the route of b. you don't have anything going to the Director. The man could retire as scheduled and we would get a routine request to hire an annuitant.

25X1

[]: Or the third alternative is he reverts from Career Agent to Contract Employee and remains as a Contract Employee on the rolls. The DDP can extend a Contract Employee, whereas a Career Agent has to come to the Director.

25X1

25X1

MR. FISHER: If we are recommending b. I'd go back to [] and tell him we don't need anyone's approval for that. Actually, I discussed this with [] and told him it was an unfortunate way to do it. They should have recommended a. and if it was turned down then he could do b., but it had rolled too far to draw it back and rewrite it.

25X1

[] I move we approve.

[] I'll second.

MR. FISHER: And I assume we have one dissent?

25X1

[] You have mine, yes.

25X1

MR. FISHER: (Addressing [].) I assume you are voting for?

25X1

[] Yes.

. . . . This motion was then passed

25X1

MR. FISHER: (Addressing []) I tend to agree with you and I think the Director will probably reverse this. My personal sympathies are with the guy but my logic is the other way.

10
SECRET

25X1

I have asked [] if he could come down. He got this word very late, I'm sorry, so I don't know whether he is going to make it or not. Just to get it rolling, my feeling is the only time we are even interested in is the time in SR Division from '52 to '54 and the 10 months as Chief of Operations Division in OPC which would be a total of 34 months. I can't see anything in his duties at [] that would possibly qualify him. I'd say the [] case was probably stronger than this.

25X1

[]: I think in Tom's case it is a little different because the NIFE business doesn't deal with the rest of the Agency. It deals with other [] members and that he wouldn't be allowed to disclose to anybody.

MR. FISHER: Why can't he? Liaison with all members of the Intelligence Community in the highest levels.

[]: I think that would start a real wave of people coming in.

MR. FISHER: Charley, do you have any information on the [] time?

[] No.

MR. FISHER: That means we have to look for 27 months -- *out of 34*

[]: Which means we have to have more explicit information on his time.

MR. FISHER: That's why I asked Tom to come down and tell us about these personal cases. There is no rush. He is not indicating a retirement date here so I don't feel we are under the gun. I told him if he is free to come down and if not we would put him on next time.

The next one is a [] in Finance requesting an extension under CIARDS for two years. As he indicates he would like to have four or five. It looks like a clear-cut financial need to put four children through college. It looks like a clear need. He has only worked 22 and a half years. His basic annuity is \$8,500.00 and reduced annuity \$7,900.00. You find yourself agreeing with him that is not a lot of money to put four kids through college. It is not unlike some others who reach mandatory retirement age and have to put kids through college and I think it would be a very unfortunate precedent.

[]: One thing does seem possible - to extend him to 30 June which would still seem to me to meet [] requirement and give him that much more time back in the States in which to find another job -- June '72. Keep it in the fiscal year. I think we are on compassionate grounds and not needs to the service.

SECRET

In other words you are giving the guy about eight months or so or a fraction thereof in which to find a job. He has been out of the country which means he probably would have trouble doing any job hunting.

25X1

. . . . [] at this point joined the meeting

MR. FISHER: Where there is not enough information rather than ask you to write more we thought we could talk to you. We are trying to zero in a little on your time in SR Division and approximately 24 months, I guess, and 10 months as Chief of Operations Division there in OPC in an effort to find out how much of that time you spent - there is an indication here you worked directly with some agent activity. Could you give us a little fill in?

[] What years?

MR. FISHER: 1952 to 1954.

[]: I can give you examples. I think you have been through one case exactly like this -- [] got credit for this same thing.

MR. FISHER: [] got credit for special things he was doing for the Director.

[]: I felt his SR service had been instrumental in this. This was his feeling.

I don't know how much of this goes into the record?

MR. FISHER: It depends on how extensive it is. We sometimes delete it.

. . . . Off the record

25X1

. . . . Mr. Parrott left the meeting

MR. FISHER: I do think [] was a little different because he did get in the fact that he had some very unusual duties for the Director and also [] was looking for about five or six months.

25X1

SECRET

25X1

25X1

[] Did we discuss [] case in detail?
[]: Yes, before you came on board.

. . . . Off the record

25X1

MR. FISHER: It's too bad we couldn't get it documented but I think it is safe to document for what [] had to say was that he was involved, or he had people working under him who were involved in the local training of foreign nationals for deployment behind the Curtain and as Deputy Chief of [] [] he visited these [] a couple of times a week during this entire period of time. He also mentioned that he had spent two or three months during which time he with others were involved in the handling of a key Soviet defector.

25X1

[] case is just like [] when he was DDP and [] [], if he needed some additional time or [] or any of these who are chiefs of CS components. How can they be more operational than this and yet I think you have to consider all these cases just the same. I don't think you can take [] and say because he happened to be in [] was under [] that this has any meaning.

25X1

[] I agree.

MR. FISHER: Which way are you arguing?

[]: I'm arguing the chiefs of CS components running operations world-wide all the time - these are qualifying service.

MR. FISHER: I can't buy that. I'm sympathetic to the concept but we haven't gotten that as policy.

[]: How does the chief of a division get qualifying credit? He doesn't go to the field.

25X1

MR. FISHER: Many of them have. [] has qualifying service and [] has.

25X1

[] But [] doesn't. Would you say [] isn't operational enough?

MR. FISHER: I have (11) (a), (b), and (c), and I don't see where Mr. [] had stringent practice of tradecraft nor do I see any hazard.

[]: But they would qualify under (b), wouldn't they? (reading): "... under conditions of employment requiring the continuing practice of most

25X1

SECRET

MR. FISHER: No, sir. I don't see where he does. I really don't, but I'm sure he sat here in Langley, and I don't know what cover he had but I'm sure if he had cover it was official and I think he went home every day just as everyone else does and occasionally drove out to [] and said, "How are things going?" Now if you can swing over to say automatically a chief of division is qualified, that's another ball game.

[] Maybe you ought to try that on the boss sometime.

25X1

MR. FISHER: I was a little uncomfortable about [] but we agreed it was some of the things he did for the Director rather than being Chief of SB. You said the chief and now ^{you're} saying the deputy chief. How about number three and the chief of operations. Where do you stop it?

25X1

[] I'm a little uneasy about [] case, frankly, because I think I can visualize what he was doing for those three years and I think it doesn't have the elements that have been written into the Reg. I mean []

25X1

MR. FISHER: I don't see a full 27 months. If he was looking for four or five you could say maybe out of that time he really did a little bit, but I don't know, maybe we have a motion. One way or the other we could get some kind of resolution because [] could well appeal it. If don't think he would appeal it officially. I think he will probably go see the Director. I realize this prejudices the case but my own idea is the Director would wonder what the hell we are doing if we approve it. I'm ready to have any motion.

[]: I don't see how we could recommend this case unless we say all chiefs and deputy chiefs and DP's and ADP's automatically qualify.

MR. FISHER: How about Chief OSA and OSP? Again, where do you stop that one?

[]: I'd rather take a vote if it isn't a matter of talking to Colonel White and saying that this is the way we come out.

MR. FISHER: I have talked to Colonel White on it.

[]: He flipped it right back?

MR. FISHER: Yes. You are not going to get any real help. He is saying the Board has got to call it as it sees it.

[]: Then let's recommend disapproval and get the policy out.

SECRET

25X1

~~SECRET~~

[] I second.

25X1 This motion was then passed

25X1

[]: There is a period - [] had 11 years, I take it in DDP,
as such. After this he was more - it's even less after this. He was on []
business and other business here in town. In effect we are giving him credit for
60 months out of about an eight year span, less than three years of which he did
spend on overseas activities. It's a little hard to argue the pattern of his
activities was such he was subject to qualifying duty at any time. In fact, the
pattern has been something else.

25X1 case Off the record

25X1

MR. FISHER: [] has recommended we disapprove.

[]: I'll go along with that.

I would like to point out, if you will notice, I'm particularly
impatient with managers who have known we have had a policy something like 14
years and say we need more time to recruit - that type of extension. I think
managers have a responsibility around here and many are not living up to that
responsibility. They are clinging to the Board all the time. When we get into a case
like [], this is strictly on the man's circumstances and that's another ball
game and I take an entirely different approach to that type of case.

MR. FISHER: The man would love five years. To hand him nine more
months I don't know that that would mean a lot to him. On the other hand, the
sooner he gets out and finds a job --

[] Is he in the system?

[]: He is already in the system.

MR. FISHER: His only point is the man will not come back until June 1971
and he arrives back in this cold cruel world where hiring is tight and he has four
months to try to find a job.

[]: I think you could use your two months.

[]: That will take him through December, which is one alternative,
but there is another still within the fiscal year to take him to 30 June.

[]: I move we put it at 31 December, with your authority.

MR. FISHER: It would have to go to the Director. The Director has to
agree with our recommendation. It would have to go up anyway but I'd be glad to
say we would bring him to the end of the year and I don't think I'd have to emphasize

SECRET

the tax business. Since he only returns in June it would give him six months.

25X1

[] You are giving him a two months extension.

25X1

MR. FISHER: That's all.

25X1

[] You have changed the four months to six months.

[] As far as we are concerned it is a two months extension.

That's not very much for this guy.

25X1

[]: The Board isn't giving him anything, really.

MR. FISHER: You are talking about giving him time to find a job.

You can't tie it to compassion because we have too many with kids to send through college.

25X1

[]: But here's a man who has been out of the country.

25X1

MR. FISHER: Then we are arguing six months, nine months?

[]: Here's a guy who was out of the country because he said:

"Send me overseas so I can qualify for the retirement system," so we do that, and using that same gimmick to extend him.

25X1

[]: The man has 24 years of service.

[]: And he knew five years ago that this was his close-out date.

[]: He is doing what any head of the family ought to do -- try to work out the best deal he can and I'm for giving him a little help. It doesn't cost us anything.

25X1

MR. FISHER: [], however, is trying to enforce a policy and I wonder what it will do to him in terms of precedent if we start giving out nine months extensions?

25X1

[]: Why don't we ask him?

MR. FISHER: I'd get away from the compassion part. We are really saying since the man has to find other work, and he is only getting back in June, three months seems like a short time to find work, therefore we want to give him some additional time.

25X1

[]: He has to relocate the whole tribe.

25X1

25X1

[]: We just turned down []

MR. FISHER: I lean a little toward the December date myself because we have been giving --

25X1

[]: I'll go with December

25X1

MR. FISHER: How do you feel, []

25X1

[]: I think December is fine.

SECRET

25X1

~~SECRET~~

MR. FISHER: [] how do you feel about the extension? Does December sound reasonable to you?

25X1

[]: Yes, it does.

25X1

[]: I guess [] recommendation was any extension be disapproved.

MR. FISHER: He is trying to hold the line all the way down. Okay, so we will go for December 31. I think we have that motion.

25X1

. . . . This motion was then passed

MR. FISHER: We move to [] for an extension from July 31st to 31 January -- just six months. To me it's a very well documented operational need. Does anyone have any problem with this one? I think he is truly needed by Logistics.

25X1

[] said in here that if he doesn't extend he will have to try to recruit another qualified man. He hasn't tried DDP yet.

25X1

MR. FISHER: I think we are ready for a motion on [] 25X1

[]: I move we approve.

[]: I second.

25X1

. . . . This motion was then passed

25X1

MR. FISHER: Then we have []. To refresh your memory - I don't have the old Minutes but I think you will recall - were all of you present when [] was here?

25X1

[]: No, I wasn't.

25X1

MR. FISHER: Anyway, on [], [] said he would go back and precisely document the case with times of every bit of covert training he did. I guess I'm trying to read between the lines but the fact that we have heard nothing further from [] -- just another statement from the man for the record unsigned by anybody -- sort of persuades me Sid was not all that enthusiastic about it.

25X1

25X1

[] hasn't come back?

MR. FISHER: This is it. We got back a memo dated 3 February written by the man. If you recall this is the one where we pulled out the Fitness Reports and you wouldn't think they were talking about the same man. It's on a two and a half year period that he is talking about. He has 32 months, to be generous, and he needs 24 of that 32 and the Fitness Reports for that time indicated he was keeping files, records and storing photo equipment and they didn't even

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

mention covert training. He has mentioned two or three incidents here and I'm sure they are all quite accurate but my feeling is they are isolated incidents in an otherwise routine career.

25X1 []: That is exactly the impression I got. Is there any point
25X1 in reminding [], or how far do we go in doing this?

25X1 []: I think we have to go back to []
[]: But as it stands we are going to disapprove it.

25X1

MR. FISHER: We are not trying to be precise but he said half the
25X1 time he was doing covert training. Even that wouldn't give him the necessary
time. [] seemed to think his records were better than they were. I just feel the
Fitness Reports written at that time were awfully damaging. There wasn't a word
about covert training. It gave six and seven duties the man had. I don't see
how he could possibly be spending 50% of his time on covert training and if he
did that still wouldn't give it to him. Is it the feeling of the Board to go back
and say, "Is this the best you can do?"

25X1 []: It would give him a fairer chance.
[]: The things he responded to in his letter are not the things
we are interested in. How he did his job and overtime, so I don't think we have
anything more to work on than we did before and I'd send it back to [] and
25X1 say that if this is the record the Board can't go along with it.

25X1 []: He has 31 years of service. 25X1

MR. FISHER: This man has no problem. I think [] was sort of weakening
on this case when he was here. I think we could quote that he finally almost
25X1 broke down and said his job as manager is to get some of these people out. He
gave up on [] altogether but on this fellow he said, "Let me go back and
see if I can't give you times this fellow was really engaged in this activity."
Then we get back something from the man which to me identifies about six or seven
weeks during this time that he actually trained somebody.

Now I was talking about the period from June '54 to '57. This
is his Fitness Report for the year ending April '55 when nobody had any idea
they would be trying to get him into the system. It says,

25X1 [] teaches photography to Agency personnel which
involves lecture and demonstration periods. He is charged with
maintaining stock supply records and ordering of necessary equipment.
When called upon he assists the various Divisions in the selection
of equipment for an intended assignment and extracts the necessary

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

25X1

stock numbers so as to avoid errors in ordering. Within the past six months this Section Chief was away for a total of eight weeks. During these periods of absence [] was burdened by extra classroom sessions plus the TSS Briefing lectures usually given by the Chief."

That is the first year - not a word about training agents. The next year, April '56,

"Instructor assigned to TSS/TD for scheduled classes tutatorial and covert training ..."

-- and this one mentioned covert training with an asterisk --

"... including operational type problems in D.C. Gives lectures and demonstrations in assisting OTR courses. Maintains stock records and inventory. Is on standby for immediate travel duties."

Finally, for the last in April 1957 they give his specific duties as,

"Performs darkroom duties, use of all types of cameras, maintains stock inventory, writes requisitions, manages files, writes technical reports and photographic instructor."

I can't believe if he did a lot of training of agents somehow it would have shown. I'm equally sure he probably had these two or three assignments during that period so I really don't see it. Do you feel I ought to call [] first before we vote?

25X1

25X1

[] Yes. He has at least commented.

[] Tell him as it stands it's going to be unfavorable.

MR. FISHER: Okay, that wraps it up for today.

25X1

[]: Will we table it then?

MR. FISHER: Yes.

25X1

25X1

[]: Put [] on for next time.

25X1

25X1

[]: It is getting very close to the time [] asked to retire, which is 30 April.

25X1

MR. FISHER: Let me put it this way. May I have the Board's word, if

[] puts up his hands and says, "That's the best I can do" - subject to [] being able to embellish and amplify --

25X1

25X1

[] This says not till October '72.

25X1

[]: He sent in a voluntary retirement action contingent on getting into the system.

25X1

[]: We allow for the appeal time.

MR. FISHER: Okay, I guess that does it. Thank you all very much.

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

. . . . The meeting ended at 3:30 p.m.

25X1

NOTE: [REDACTED], Support Officer for TSD, was subsequently
asked by the Board Secretary if there was any further information to be
provided by TSD or if [REDACTED] memo of 3 February was to stand on its own.
[REDACTED] confirmed that nothing further would be forthcoming on the [REDACTED] case.

25X1

~~SECRET~~